



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,747	08/28/2001	Shelby Freland Thames	TH1802 (US)	5763
75	90 09/25/2002			
Donald F. Haas Shell Oil Company Legal-Intellectual Property			EXAMINER	
			SHORT, PATRICIA A	
P.O. Box 2463	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Houston, TX 7	7232-2403		1712	
			DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002	!

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<u> </u>
·	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Offic Action Summan	09/940747	Thames et al
Offic Action Summary	Examiner	Group Art Unit
	Short	19(2
 The MAILING DATE of this communication app 	pears on the cover sheet b	eneath the correspondence address—
P riod for Reply	11	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SI OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	ET TO EXPIRE Three	MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by a Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 	/s, a reply within the statutory mir default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr by statute, cause the application	nimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	_	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on	enuary 2, 2	002
☐ This action is FINAL .	,	
 Since this application is in condition for allowance exaccordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 	cept for formal matters, pro 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213	secution as to the merits is closed in
Disposition of Claims		
Claim(s) 1 - (5		is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s)		
Of the above claim(s)		is/are withdrawn from consideration.
□ Clạim(s)		is/are allowed.
		is/are allowed.
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed. is/are rejected.
□ Claim(s)		is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
☐ Claim(s)	ol∫ol is X approved	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
☐ Claim(s)	ol∫ol is X approved	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) Claim(s) The proposed drawing correction, filed on	ol∫ol is X approved	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is approved approved believed to by the Examiner	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
☐ Claim(s) ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ is/are of ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.	is approved approved believed to by the Examiner	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election
Claim(s) Cla	is approved objected to by the Examiner er.	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
☐ Claim(s) ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ is/are of ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er.	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
Claim(s) Cla	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved)	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ Claim(s) ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on ☐ is/are of ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have be ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have be ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have be	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. rity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved approved ap	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
Claim(s) Cla	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. Prity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved to by the Examiner er. Prity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved to be application in the state of	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
Claim(s) Cla	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. The province of the examiner of the exam	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
Claim(s) Cla	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. Prity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved approved a	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
Claim(s) Cla	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. Prity under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (approved approved a	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.
□ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ The proposed drawing correction, filed on □ is/are of the priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d) □ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign prio □ All □ Some* □ None of the: □ Certified copies of the priority documents have be □ Copies of the certified copies of the priority document in this national stage application from the Internation □ Claim(s) □ Claim(s) □ 2/3 □ 3/4 □ 3/4 □ 4/2 □ 4/3 □ 4/3 □ 5/4 □ 6/4	is approved approved objected to by the Examiner er. If you are the control of t	is/are allowed. is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restriction or election requirement disapproved.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00)

Part of Pap r No.



Art Unit: 1712

The amendment filed January 2, 2002 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132 because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132 states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: Support for the change in Table 8 form PT-30 to PT-15 is not apparent. Applicant relies upon Figure 4 to support this change. However, it appears that Figure 4 is derived from the data in columns labeled T-00, T-30, T-30 and T-50 in Table 8. Figure 4 appears to support a change from T-30 to T-15 for the second column in Table 8 rather than a change from PT-30 to PT-15 in the last two columns.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are confusing in that claim 1 requires an aliphatic glycol that is 5 to 90% 1, 3-propane diol while claim 2 recites a Markush group of aliphatic glycols in which 1,3-propane diol is not even a member and claim 3 requires neopentyl glycol. In claims 5 and 14, it is not clear what is meant by neopentyl glycol substituted with 15 to 50% on a molar basis with 1,3-propane diol. Does the polyester contain 15 to 50% on a molar basis of 1, 3-propanediol with the remainder of the aliphatic glycol being neopentyl glycol? Claim 11 does not appear to further limit claim 1 that requires an aliphatic glycol that is 5 to 90% 1, 3-propane diol. In claims 6 and 7, "and" rather than "or" should be used to join members of the Markush groups.



Application/Control Number: 09/940,747

Art Unit: 1712

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-9 and 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merck. The reference teaches powder coating compositions comprising a polyester made from terephthalic acid and neopentyl glycol with another aliphatic diol, and glycidyl isocyanurate having improved mechanical properties. See examples. Neopentyl glycol is used in amounts of at least 50% with other aliphatic diols that include 1, 3-propanediol and optional branching agents. See column 3, lines 34-50. As suggested by the reference, it would have been obvious to use a combination of at least 50% neopentyl glycol with 1, 3 propanediol when preparing the polyester and combine with glycidyl isocyanurate in order to obtain a powder coating having improved mechanical properties. Absent a showing of criticality commensurate in scope with the claims, the claims are unpatentable over the reference.

Claims 1-3 and 5-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsiat. The reference teaches powder coating compositions comprising a polyester made from terephthalic acid and isophthalic acid with neopentyl glycol and another aliphatic glycol, and glycidyl isocyanurate having improved properties. See Example 6. Other aliphatic glycols include 1, 3-propanediol. See column 3, lines 53-56. As suggested by the reference, it would have been obvious to use a combination of neopentyl glycol and 1, 3 propanediol with a combination of terephthalic acid and isophthalic acid when preparing the polyester and combine with glycidyl isocyanurate in order to obtain a powder coating having improved properties. Absent a showing of criticality commensurate in scope with the claims, the claims are unpatentable over the reference.



Application/Control Number: 09/940,747

Art Unit: 1712

P. Short September 18, 2002 Phone (703) 308-2395 Fax (703) 872-9310

> PATRICIA A. SHORT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 4

Petra a Set